REMARKS

In response to the non-final office action of January 12, 2007, applicants ask that all claims be allowed in view of the amendment to the claims and the following remarks.

Claims 1-26 are currently pending, of which claims 1, 10, and 18 are independent. Claims 1-3, 10, 13, and 18-22 have been amended, and claims 23-26 have been added. Support for these amendments and new claims may be found in the application at, for example, page 11, line 25 through page 14, line 2. No new matter has been introduced.

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Dada for the courtesy extended to Applicants' representatives during the telephone interview on March 2, 2007. This reply reflects the substance of the interview.

Claims 18-22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 18-22 have been amended. The amendments of claims 18-22 are believed to address all of the Examiner's concerns. Therefore, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 1-22 have been rejected as being anticipated by Hashimoto (EP 0 992 873 A2). Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Hashimoto does not describe or suggest the subject matter of independent claims 1, 10, and 18, as described below.

As amended, independent claim 1 recites a computer-implemented method for generating access control information. The method includes receiving an access control rule that identifies a characteristic and programmatically identifying at least one entry in user information that is associated with the identified characteristic. The method also includes programmatically identifying at least one entry in data object information that is associated with the identified characteristic and generating access control information that permits at least one user associated with the at least one entry in the user information to access the at least one entry in the data object information.

Hashimoto does not describe or suggest programmatically identifying at least one entry in data object information that is associated with the identified characteristic and generating access

Applicant : Matthias Vogel et al.   Attorney's Docket No.: 13906-134001 / 2003P00532
Serial No. : 10/642,500   US
Filed : August 18, 2003
Page : 11 of 13

control information that permits access to the at least one entry in the data object information, as recited in amended independent claim 1.

Instead, Hashimoto is directed to a system configured to allow a system administrator to define access rights for content based on roles of users. See Hashimoto at paragraphs [0050]-[0060]. Specifically, the system displays an access-right pattern list on a display device and allows a setter to choose the content to which access rights based on the access-right pattern list are set. See Hashimoto at paragraph [0056]. The setter is a person that provides user input to the system to set access rights based on information displayed on a display device of the system. See Hashimoto at paragraphs [0051], [0056], and [0132]. See also Fig. 14 (illustrating setter 62 as being a person). As such, Hashimoto does not describe or suggest programmatically identifying at least one entry in data object information that is associated with the identified characteristic and generating access control information for the at least one entry. Rather, Hashimoto describes a system in which a person manually chooses content and the system generates access rights for the content chosen by the person. Thus, Hashimoto fails to describe or suggest programmatically identifying at least one entry in data object information that is associated with the identified characteristic and generating access control information that permits access to the at least one entry in the data object information, as recited in amended independent claim 1.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-9.

Independent claim 18 recites features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1, and does so in the context of a computer-readable medium. Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 18 and its dependent claims 19-22.

Independent claim 10, as amended, recites a computer system for managing access control information for software operating on the computer system that includes, inter alia, an executable software module that causes (1) programmatic comparison of the user characteristic, the business data object characteristic, and the shared characteristic and (2) generation of access

control information. As discussed above, Hashimoto fails to describe or suggest programmatically identifying at least one entry in data object information that is associated with the identified characteristic and generating access control information that permits access to the at least one entry in the data object information. Thus, Hashimoto also fails to describe or suggest an executable software module that causes (1) programmatic comparison of the user characteristic, the business data object characteristic, and the shared characteristic and (2) generation of access control information, as recited in amended independent claim 10.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 10 and its dependent claims 11-17.

New claims 23-26 each depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 1. At least for the reason of that dependency and the reasons noted above with respect to independent claim 1, applicants submit that claims 23-26 are allowable.

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicant : Matthias Vogel et al.
Serial No. : 10/642,500
Filed : August 18, 2003
Page : 13 of 13

Attorney's Docket No.: 13906-134001 / 2003P00532
US

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

The fee in the amount of $200.00 in payment of the for excess claim fees is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _3/28/07_

Jeremy J. Monaldo
Reg. No. 58,680

Customer No. 32864
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40393474.doc